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This research brief presents interim recidivism outcomes, as part of the Urban Institute’s (the Institute) analysis of the Safer Return Demonstration. Safer Return, a reentry program, operated in Chicago’s Garfield Park neighborhood from 2008 through 2012. It was planned to (1) address key needs of formerly incarcerated persons, such as gainful employment, stable housing, and access to services; (2) improve the local conditions that present barriers to successful reentry, by increasing access to prosocial activities and positive role models; and (3) introduce system reforms, such as neighborhood-based parole officers and family-inclusive case management. Interim analyses were conducted to provide a preliminary look at the outcomes of Safer Return, focusing exclusively on one-year individual recidivism rates. For this brief, recidivism is defined as returns to the state prison system, the Illinois Department of Corrections (IDOC), for both new crimes and supervision violations among individuals released from state prison to two high-density prisoner reentry neighborhoods from April 2008 through January 2012. Forthcoming reports will build on the data provided herein, to discuss the long-term impacts of Safer Return on a range of reentry and reintegration outcomes to which the Safer Return program was expected to impact.

To provide a first look at Safer Return’s short-term outcomes, this brief begins with a discussion of the research methodology, including the quasi-experimental evaluation design developed to assess the impact of Safer Return, as well as the specific data sources and analyses used to explore recidivism outcomes in the current analysis. The findings for three separate comparison groups are discussed, including preliminary implications of these findings informed by the sample demographic profiles (see Appendix A). Finally, we include a short section on data limitations, summary remarks, and next steps.

**Evaluation Methodology**

The Safer Return evaluation uses a quasi-experimental design, focusing on individual, family, and community outcomes. Following a 2008 analysis of data on crime trends, sociodemographic characteristics, land-use patterns, and reentry rates, the Institute selected West Englewood as the comparison community for East Garfield Park (the initial community selected for the demonstration). West Englewood is located on the South Side of Chicago, while East Garfield Park is situated on the West Side of Chicago. Shortly after implementation of Safer Return began, service delivery in the demonstration community was expanded to include West Garfield Park (located west of East Garfield Park). For the purposes of the evaluation, we refer to the demonstration community as Garfield Park since the boundaries include all of East Garfield Park and West Garfield Park. Further, both of the neighborhoods, demonstration and comparison, are herein defined by their corresponding zip codes, which mostly, but not entirely approximate the official Garfield Park and West Englewood community area boundaries.

With this brief’s focus on individual outcomes, we identified three separate groups to provide context for the potential impact of Safer Return on recidivism. The use of multiple comparison groups to Safer Return participants is intended to help us triangulate on the true effect of Safer Return. First, to provide general context regarding the reentry landscape in the two Chicago neighborhoods, we compare the reincarceration rates for two groups of Chicago parolees who did not participate in Safer Return: (a) releases to the Garfield Park neighborhood (demonstration community) and (b) releases to the West Englewood neighborhood (comparison community). Second, to understand whether Safer Return participation has beneficial outcomes relative to those achieved by individuals released to the comparison community, we compare the reincarceration rates for (a) Safer Return participants (treatment group) and (b) releases to West Englewood (comparison community). This comparison provides information as to whether participants in the program had better recidivism outcomes than those released to a community where the comprehensive community-based services offered by Safer Return were not implemented. Third, to understand whether Safer Return participation has beneficial outcomes relative to those achieved by individuals who returned to the demonstration community, but did not participate in Safer Return, we compare reincarceration rates for (a) Safer Return participants (treatment group) and (b) Garfield Park releases who did not participate in Safer Return (demonstration community).
Data Sources

We used data from two sources for this interim analysis: IDOC administrative records; and Safer Return program records.

Release Data and Demographic Data

Data were used to determine which formerly incarcerated persons would be included in each of the three separate comparison groupings. IDOC administrative records were used to identify all releases from an IDOC facility to either Garfield Park or West Englewood from April 2008 through January 2012.4 While efforts were made to identify a contemporaneous cohort of individuals released to the two neighborhoods, our sample was ultimately identified using archived parole plan data. Individuals who listed an address to any one of the three zip codes corresponding to one of the two study neighborhoods in his or her parole plan prior to release from prison were included in our study sample. This methodology only identifies people who were released onto parole, not those discharged from an IDOC facility without a form of community supervision. All individuals paroled during the study period to the two neighborhoods were included in the analysis. Safer Return program records were used to determine which individuals participated in Safer Return and the release date that corresponded to his or her program participation.

Many of the parolees who participated in Safer Return or were identified through IDOC administrative records had multiple releases during the demonstration enrollment timeframe (April 2008 through January 2012). As such, some parolees could have been designated in multiple categories of our three comparison groupings. For example, some individuals were paroled to Garfield Park (demonstration neighborhood) multiple times during the demonstration enrollment timeframe, but decided to participate in Safer Return in only one of those separate IDOC release periods. Other individuals with multiple releases during the demonstration enrollment timeframe were paroled to both the demonstration community (Garfield Park) and the comparison community (West Englewood). Many others were paroled to addresses outside of the two study neighborhoods before being paroled to either Garfield Park or West Englewood. Therefore, to ensure we did not contaminate the sample groups, we used the following criteria to categorize parolees with multiple releases during the study timeframe.

- Any parolees who participated in Safer Return were always designated Safer Return participants and the first parole or community return during which they participated in Safer Return was used in the current analysis.5
- For Safer Return nonparticipants, the first parole to one of the zip codes corresponding to the study communities was used to determine their analytic grouping and the appropriate one-year follow-up period.

All demographic data were generated from IDOC administrative records. Demographic variables isolated in the IDOC data are age at release, age at first custody, gender, and race.6 Demographic data were accessed for those identified through parole data as being released to one of the study neighborhoods, as well as those individuals identified as Safer Return participants who may not have been directly released to Garfield Park.7 IDOC data that identified individuals’ marital status, security level, and risk level were unreliable.8

Criminal Justice History and Outcome Data

The following criminal justice data from IDOC were accessed for each person identified in the study sample.

- **Movement into and out of IDOC**: All admissions to IDOC facilities, releases from IDOC facilities, and discharges from IDOC custody starting in April 2008 to August 2013. The date of each admission, release, and discharge was also recorded. Data for all Illinois zip codes were available for every release, admission, and discharge starting in April 2008 to the present.
- **Criminal history data**: All historical offenses for which an individual was incarcerated in IDOC was captured, which includes offense type, date of offense commission, date offender was brought into custody, and the maximum sentence imposed. These data are available for every offense
starting at the beginning of each individual’s criminal history in IDOC to August 2013, regardless of his or her zip code of release.

Data Analysis Strategy

These IDOC administrative data were used to determine (1) any reincarceration within one year; (2) whether the reincarceration was for a technical violation or new offense; and (3) time to reincarceration. The one-year window from release to potential reincarceration was computed for each individual, beginning the day of his or her release from an IDOC facility that placed him or her in the respective sample. Each of the analyses presented herein is bivariate, using t-tests. However, given that bivariate analyses do not take into account underlying differences between samples, we also performed multivariate logistic regressions using available demographic data. For example, if Safer Return participants are generally older than parolees in the comparison neighborhood, it could be argued that any reduction in recidivism is an artifact of that demographic difference and not the result of exposure to the program. Our multivariate logistic regressions include age, race, gender, number of previous offenses, age at first custody, and treatment condition as potential explanatory variables for the reincarceration within one year outcome. With only one exception, which is noted below, the logistic regressions confirmed each of the bivariate results presented.

We used three separate comparison groupings based on the evaluation’s quasi-experimental design to understand the potential impact of Safer Return. Since the Safer Return services were determined by the community to which individuals returned, the community of release—Garfield Park and West Englewood—is used as the primary basis for comparison. This evaluation design strategy introduces selection bias because, while comparable, the neighborhoods may differ in some unobservable way that contributes to reentry success or failure (e.g., community support for returning prisoners). Further, those who participated in the Safer Return program may differ in some unobservable way from those in Garfield Park who chose not to participate in Safer Return (e.g., motivation and readiness to change). Therefore, our multiple comparisons analytic strategy is intended to gain a fuller picture of the potential effectiveness of Safer Return, with an understanding that any one of the following comparisons may be biased in unobservable ways:

- Parolees to Garfield Park who did not participate in Safer Return compared with parolees to West Englewood;
- Safer Return participants compared with parolees to West Englewood; and
- Safer Return participants compared nonparticipating parolees to Garfield Park.

Demographic Profiles

Basic demographic profiles for each of the comparison groups are included in the appendices and summarized below. Despite many statistically significant differences between each of the groupings, as highlighted below, the samples are generally fairly similar.

- **Parolees to Garfield Park not participating in Safer Return (n = 4,930) and parolees to West Englewood (n = 1,405):** Garfield Park parolees were significantly older, included more males, and had more offenses in their criminal history than parolees to West Englewood. Garfield Park parolees were also more racially diverse than West Englewood parolees. The majority of parolees in each neighborhood were black; however, more Hispanics and whites were paroled to Garfield Park than West Englewood.
- **Safer Return participants (n = 719) and West Englewood parolees (n = 1,405):** Safer Return participants were, on average, older at release than West Englewood parolees. Safer Return participants have more offenses in their criminal histories prior to release compared to West Englewood parolees. More Safer Return participants were male, and fewer Safer Return participants were black than West Englewood releases.
- **Safer Return participants (n = 719) and Garfield Park parolees not participating in Safer Return (n = 4,930):** Safer Return participants were generally similar to Garfield Park parolees who did not participate in the program. But, Safer Return participants were significantly
older than other Garfield Park parolees. Safer Return participants had more offenses in their
criminal history than Garfield Park parolees who did not participate in Safer Return. Safer Return
participants were racially different than nonparticipating Garfield Park parolees: fewer Safer
Return participants were Hispanic or white than Safer Return nonparticipants paroled to Garfield
Park.

As can be the case in any quasi-experimental design, there are some significant differences between
the three comparison groupings. These differences are both statistical and substantive. For example, while
the difference in previous offenses is relatively moderate in some of the comparison groupings, the
difference in racial/ethnic breakdown could be considered substantial. Yet, given that the number of
people in most of the comparison groups is high, the statistical difference may not have a substantial
analytic impact. The magnitude of some of the statistical differences is not large. It is clear, however, that
West Englewood parolees have some substantial differences from both participating and nonparticipating
Garfield Park parolees generally.

**Bivariate Analyses on Reincarceration**

Tables 1–3 show the bivariate results of statistical tests of differences between the three comparison
groups for the following outcomes: (1) any reincarceration within one year; (2) reincarceration for new
offense within one year; (3) reincarceration for technical violation within one year; and (4) time to first
reincarceration.

Table 1 shows the comparison in recidivism outcomes between all parolees released to Garfield Park
who did not participate in Safer Return and all parolees released to West Englewood. Roughly one-third
of parolees returning to Garfield Park and West Englewood were reincarcerated within one year of their
release from prison, with more individuals returning to prison for technical violations instead of new
crimes. Parolees in both neighborhoods who recidivated were in the community for approximately five
and a half months before their reincarceration.9 For two of the recidivism outcomes explored, West
Englewood parolees had significantly better outcomes than Garfield Park parolees. West Englewood
parolees were significantly less likely to be reincarcerated within one year of release, driven by the
statistically significant difference in reincarceration for technical violations.

Garfield Park and West Englewood parolees were significantly different with respect to several
demographic variables. Multivariate regression that controlled for available demographic characteristics
(age at release, age at first custody, number of previous IDOC offenses, gender, and race/ethnicity)
confirmed the significant impact of the return community on two of the four recidivism outcomes. The
marginally significant difference in reincarceration for new crimes between the return communities was
inconsistent with the multivariate regression findings. A logistic regression model estimating the effect of
the return community on new crimes was not significant. The finding that West Englewood parolees fared
better than those returning to Garfield Park is perhaps surprising given the results of the evaluation’s
complementary community surveys, which showed that Garfield Park residents rated their community
resources more favorably than West Englewood residents, and that Garfield Park residents were
reportedly more welcoming to formerly incarcerated persons than residents in West Englewood.10

Table 2 shows the comparison in recidivism outcomes between Safer Return participants relative to
all West Englewood parolees who, by virtue of their reentry neighborhood, were not eligible for Safer
Return services. While fewer Safer Return participants were reincarcerated within one year of release
than West Englewood parolees, the difference between the two sample groups is not statistically
significant. Safer Return participants also appear to be in the community for longer periods of time before
their first reincarceration, relative to West Englewood parolees. Yet, there are no statistically significant
differences between the two groups for any of the recidivism outcomes explored. Additional analyses,
which will be detailed in forthcoming reports on the evaluation findings, will explore whether the benefit
of Safer Return participation is better over a longer period of time. It is possible that the benefit of Safer
Return participation is greater in the long term (i.e., more than one year), when participants have had a
longer time within the program. Safer Return participants and West Englewood parolees were
significantly different with respect to their ages at release, offense histories, gender, and racial/ethnic
background. Multivariate regression that controlled for available demographic characteristics confirmed the non-significant impact of Safer Return participation on the four recidivism outcomes.

Table 3 shows the comparison in recidivism outcomes between Safer Return participants and other Garfield Park parolees who did not participate in the Safer Return program. Safer Return participants are significantly less likely to be reincarcerated within one year of release, driven by the significant difference in reincarceration for technical violations. There is no statistically significant difference between the two samples on reincarceration for new offenses. The difference for reincarceration for technical violations is notable. Safer Return participation appears to reduce the rate of technical violations by approximately 20 percent relative to returning to Garfield Park without Safer Return participation. While there were no statistically significant differences in the time period between release and reincarceration between the two samples, Safer Return participants who were reincarcerated were in the community for slightly longer than other Garfield Park parolees who were reincarcerated. The findings in table 3, in conjunction with those in tables 1 and 2, show that, while the reentry context in Garfield Park may be less favorable than the reentry context in West Englewood, Safer Return participation has benefits for those within that neighborhood. Safer Return participants and Garfield Park parolees were significantly different with respect to their ages at release, offense histories, and racial/ethnic background. Multivariate regression that controlled for available demographic characteristics confirmed the significant impact of Safer Return participation on two of the four recidivism outcomes.

**Table 1. One-Year Recidivism Outcomes for All Garfield Park and West Englewood Parolees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Garfield Park</th>
<th>West Englewood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reincarceration (percent)***</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Offense b *</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Violation***</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to First Reincarceration (days)</td>
<td>173.2</td>
<td>171.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Urban Institute analysis of Illinois Department of Corrections data.
Note: T-Tests were used to test for statistical difference. Valid N: Garfield Park (n=4,930); West Englewood (n=1,405).

*Does not include Safer Return participants.
b Multivariate regression that controlled for demographic differences between the two cohorts of parolees did not indicate that community of release had a statistically significant impact on reincarceration for new offenses within one year.
*p <0.10; ***p < 0.01. No estimates differ significantly at the p < 0.05 level.

**Table 2. One-Year Recidivism Outcomes for Safer Return Participants and West Englewood Parolees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Safer Return Participants</th>
<th>West Englewood Parolees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reincarceration (percent)</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Offense</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Violation</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to First Reincarceration (days)</td>
<td>176.7</td>
<td>171.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Urban Institute analysis of Illinois Department of Corrections data and Safer Return program records.
Note: T-Tests were used to test for statistical difference. No estimates differ significantly at the p <0.10, p < 0.05, or p < 0.01 level.
Valid N: Safer Return (n=719); West Englewood (n=1,405).
Table 3. One-Year Recidivism Outcomes for Safer Return Participants and Nonparticipating Garfield Park Parolees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Safer Return Participants</th>
<th>Nonparticipating Garfield Park Paroleesa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reincarceration (percent)***</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Offense</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Violation***</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to Reincarceration (days)</td>
<td>176.7</td>
<td>173.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Urban Institute analysis of Illinois Department of Corrections data and Safer Return program records.

Note: T-Tests were used to test for statistical difference. Valid N: Safer Return (n=719); Garfield Park (n=4,930).

a Does not include Safer Return participants.

***p < 0.01. No estimates differ significantly at the p < 0.10 or p < 0.05 levels.

Limitations

Our analyses of recidivism include returns to the IDOC only. We are unable to demonstrate whether Safer Return participation or the return community had an impact on stays in the local jail facility (Cook County Department of Corrections), which may include some detainees pending formal charges or convictions that may later end up in the state prison system. Further, because reincarceration in state prison is a lagging recidivism indicator and is relatively difficult to detect within one year of release, analyses that focus on reincarceration rates beyond one year may yield substantially different findings. Recidivism rates within one year defined as rearrests or reconvictions may also yield different findings. Our analytical focus on parolees, due to limitations of the data collected from IDOC, represents a substantively different group of individuals than the entire IDOC release population. The findings that Safer Return has a greater impact on parole violations than new crimes would not apply to those who are released without any form of supervision. However, according to IDOC data, between 80 and 90 percent of those released from prison to the examined communities are released to community supervision. Therefore, our findings are generalizable to a large population of individuals released from state prison. Moreover, as demonstrated in the demographic profiles, there are statistically significant differences between the sample groups. As with any quasi-experimental design where the selection into the treatment category is not random, we cannot be sure if the differences in recidivism rates observed are due to other latent, unobservable characteristics, such as motivation, readiness to change, or community-specific resources.

A final limitation of this interim analysis is that the classification system we used to identify the groupings explicitly excludes relevant parole dates for certain people. Not only were some individuals released from prison multiple times to the demonstration and comparison communities, others had multiple parole periods that could potentially place them into different analytic categories. For example, three Safer Return participants were, at the time of their first release, paroled to West Englewood. By focusing exclusively on their participation in Safer Return, the current analysis ignores some information that could be gleaned about parole periods that occurred outside the examination period. In conducting the multivariate analyses, we controlled for the number of previous parole periods that placed parolees in their respective analytic category or comparison grouping. This metric is limited when compared with controlling for total previous number of incarcerations or parole periods. Since the available IDOC data for the current analyses begins in April 2008, we are observing individuals at various points on their respective criminal offending or desistance trajectories, thus the April 2008 cutoff is arbitrary.

Conclusions

The analyses show that the Safer Return model has promise, particularly in its effect on reincarcerations for parole violations. As discussed in a complementary report, the Safer Return program included a robust relationship between parole officers and the program case managers (called “reentry coaches”). The overwhelming majority of Safer Return participants were on parole. The finding that parole violations were reduced is thus not surprising and is aligned with the Safer Return program logic.11 Safer Return
participants appeared to benefit from the enhanced relationship between parole officers and case managers. Also, because a high percentage of returns to prison among the reentry population are categorized as technical violations and not new crimes, the reduction in parole violations reduced the overall reincarceration rates. Given that this analysis is preliminary, strong conclusions cannot yet be made on the impact of Safer Return on recidivism outcomes. Future analyses will more rigorously evaluate the program and include statistical controls and techniques, such as propensity weights, to balance the sample groupings and reduce selection bias to the extent possible. The inclusion of statistical controls and matching techniques will be critical, given that this initial analysis demonstrated that there were significant differences between the sample groupings and neighborhoods of release. Final analyses on the impact of Safer Return on shorter- and longer-term recidivism outcomes and other reintegration outcomes are expected in fall 2014.
## Appendix A Sample Demographics

### Table A1. Demographic Characteristics of All Garfield Park and West Englewood Parolees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Garfield Park</th>
<th>West Englewood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age at release (years)***</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at first custody (years)</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of previous offenses***</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male (percent)***</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (percent)***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>84.9</td>
<td>96.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>&gt; 0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Urban Institute analysis of Illinois Department of Corrections data.

Note: T-tests were used to test for statistical difference except for the race variable, for which a chi-square test was used; Valid N: Garfield Park (n=4,930); West Englewood (n=1,405) except for two parolees in each district with incomplete age information.

* Does not include Safer Return participants.

***p < 0.01. No estimates differ significantly at the p <0.10 and p<0.05 level.

### Table A2. Demographic Characteristics of Safer Return Participants and West Englewood Parolees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Safer Return Participants</th>
<th>West Englewood Parolees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age at release (years)***</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at first custody (years)</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of previous offenses***</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male (percent)***</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (percent)***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>96.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Urban Institute analysis of Illinois Department of Corrections data and Safer Return program records.

Note: T-Tests were used to test for statistical difference except for the race variable, for which a Chi-Square test was used; Valid N: Garfield Park (n=719); West Englewood (n=1,405) except for two parolees in West Englewood with incomplete age information.

***p < 0.01. No estimates differ significantly at the p <0.10 and p<0.05 level.
### Table A3. Demographic Characteristics of Safer Return Participants and Other Garfield Park Parolees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Safer Return Participants</th>
<th>Garfield Park Parolees&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age at release (years)<strong>&lt;sup&gt;</strong>*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at first custody (years)</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of previous offenses**&lt;sup&gt;***&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male (percent)</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>93.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (percent)<strong>&lt;sup&gt;</strong>&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>84.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>&gt; 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Urban Institute analysis of Illinois Department of Corrections data and Safer Return program records.

Note: T-Tests were used to test for statistical difference except for the race variable, for which a Chi-Square test was used. Valid N: Safer Return (n=719); Garfield Park (n=4,930) except for two parolees in Garfield Park with incomplete age information.<br>
<sup>a</sup> Does not include Safer Return participants.<br>
**<sup>p < 0.05; ***p < 0.01. No estimates differ significantly at the p <0.10 level.**
Notes


2. A final report that details information and findings from the various data collected for the evaluation is anticipated in fall 2014.

3. The zip codes include 60612 and 60624 for Garfield Park and 60636 for West Englewood. We use zip codes for our analyses since release data maintained by IDOC also uses zip codes, not designated community areas, for determining release addresses.

4. These dates correspond to the dates that Safer Return actively recruited participants into the program.

5. 727 Safer Return participants were identified through Safer Return program records. Of these, 719 participants (99 percent of the total) had a valid release date from prison that corresponded to their Safer Return enrollment timeframe. Of these, 568 (or 79 percent of the total) participated in Safer Return during their first return from prison to the demonstration community during the demonstration enrollment timeframe (April 2008 through January 2012). An additional 63 individuals (or 9 percent of the total) returned from prison to Garfield Park multiple times (following subsequent reincarcerations) and participated in Safer Return subsequent to their initial return to the demonstration community during the enrollment timeframe. Another 88 individuals (or 12 percent of the total) participated in Safer Return during a period in which they were paroled to a neighborhood other than Garfield Park. Our understanding of the program through the process evaluation suggests that (and is evidenced by the IDOC data) some Safer Return participants were released outside of Garfield Park initially and then subsequently enrolled in the Safer Return program upon relocating to Garfield Park. These parolees are included as Safer Return participants. Finally, of these, 3 individuals eventually participated in Safer Return but were paroled to West Englewood (the comparison community) for their first parole during the enrollment timeframe. These three parolees are included as Safer Return participants.

6. While having lower data quality, there is a separate ethnicity variable that is relatively consistent with the race variable.

7. See note 5; some Safer Return participants were not paroled to Garfield Park directly from prison.

8. Marital status, security level, and risk level are overwritten in the IDOC database once an individual is reincarcerated; therefore, it was not possible to use these data to understand the demographic profile of the study sample at the time of their initial release into the study sample.

9. This does not include any time spent in either police custody or the Cook County Department of Corrections (local jail).
